

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 7, 9 and 19-24 are pending in the application with the present amendments. In the Office Action, the claims as previously pending were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,349,301 to Mitchell ("*Mitchell*") or under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over *Mitchell*. For the reasons set forth below, applicants respectfully submit that the presently pending claims are fully distinguished from *Mitchell*. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

As amended herein, claim 1 now recites that the operator-controllable object is made available to the operator on the terminal computer when the operator solves a problem presented during execution of a first program on the terminal computer. However, the first program need not be the same program as the program used to display the object in the virtual world. Rather, as recited in claim 1, the first program is executable independently from executing a second program to display the object in the virtual world. Thus, an operator on the terminal computer can acquire an object during execution of the first program, e.g., a game program running independently on the terminal computer, and then use the acquired object in the virtual world that is displayed by a second program executed independently from executing the first program.

By contrast, *Mitchell* merely describes client computers in which objects in a virtual world environment ("VWE") are downloaded from a server computer and selected by the user for display. (col. 6, lns. 29-37). However, the user's use and manipulation of an object is through the "application that renders a VWE" (col. 5, lns 50-52). The passages of *Mitchell* cited by the Examiner neither teach nor suggest the recited features of claim 1 which include acquisition of an

object upon solving a problem during execution of a first program and displaying the object during execution of a second program independently from execution of the first program.

Independent claims 19-23 contain similar recitations and are submitted to be fully distinguished from *Mitchell* for at least the same reasons as discussed above in relation to claim 1.

In addition, claim 24 recites a further distinction over *Mitchell* in that an object made available by the terminal computer to the operator during execution of the first program is not defined in the virtual world prior to the execution of the first program.

Support for the present amendments is provided, inter alia, at paragraphs [0009]-[0010], [0024], [0048], [0066] and [0068]. Specific support for new claim 24 is provided at least in paragraphs [0024] and [0066].

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone Applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

Application No.: 09/976,519

Docket No.: SCEI 3.0-091

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: March 14, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Daryl K. Neff

Registration No.: 38,253

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicants

638698\_1.DOC